

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed January 11, 2006 and a telephone interview with the Examiner conducted on March 17, 2006.

Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 13 are pending in the application with Claims 1 and 11 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claim 11 has been amended. No new subject matter has been introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 1 – 10 are allowable. Also, a telephone interview with the Examiner was conducted on March 17, 2006 in order to clarify the Examiner's concerns with respect to the § 112, second paragraph rejection of Applicant's Claims 11 – 13. The Examiner expressed concern that as written, the limitation of Claim 11 directed towards the second transistor is a little ambiguous with respect to the output terminal and its relation to a clock synchronous type circuit. At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that the amendment to Claim 11 as indicated below would place Claims 11 – 13 in condition for allowance.

I. Rejection of Claims 11 - 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 11 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph because, allegedly, the limitation of Claim 11 directed towards the second transistor is ambiguous with respect to the output terminal and its relation to a clock synchronous type circuit.

In response, Claim 11 has been amended to recite: "...a first transistor having a first conductivity type and a first current supply ability, said first transistor being connected between a first voltage supply line and an output terminal to be connected to a clock synchronous type circuit, said clock synchronous type circuit operating in synchronization with one of either a

rising edge and a falling edge; and a second transistor having a second conductivity type and a second current supply ability, said second transistor being connected between a second voltage supply line and said output terminal to be connected to said clock synchronous type circuit, said second current supply ability being smaller than said first current supply ability.” (Emphasis added). The newly added phrase “to be connected to said clock synchronous type circuit” is believed to adequately clarify that the output terminal of the second transistor is the same as the output terminal of the first transistor.

Therefore, for at least the reasons given above, Claims 11 – 13 are believed to be patentably distinct and allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 11 – 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 1 – 13 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,


Paul J. Esatto, Jr.
Registration No. 30,749

SCULLY, SCOTT, MURPHY & PRESSER, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza - Ste. 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:DAT:jam